UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Seattle, Washington

October 5, 2022.

ERIC KIKKERT,

Defendant.

Defendant.

Sentencing

Sentencing

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAUREN KING UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: THOMAS M. WOODS.

US Attorney's Office

700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220

Seattle, WA 98101-1271

For the Defendant: DENNIS CARROLL

Federal Public Defender's Office

1601 5th Avenue, Suite 700 Westlake Center Office Tower

Seattle, WA 98101.

U.S. PROBATION

OFFICER: AMELIA WHALEY

Reported by: MARCI E.C. CHATELAIN, CCR, RPR, RMR,

CRR, Federal Court Reporter

700 Stewart Street, Suite 17205

Seattle, WA 98101 marci_chatelain@wawd.uscourts.gov PROCEEDINGS

3

4

2

10:02:12 5

6 7

8

10:02:25 10

11

12 13

14

10:02:31 15

_

18

19

16

17

10:02:44 20

21

23

24

22

10:03:00 25

THE CLERK: The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington is now in session, the Honorable Judge Lauren King presiding.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

THE CLERK: We are here in the matter of United States v. Eric Kikkert, cause number 22-53, assigned to this Court.

Will counsel please introduce themselves for the record?

MR. WOODS: Good morning, Your Honor.

Tom Woods on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. CARROLL: Good morning, Your Honor.

Dennis Carroll on behalf of Mr. Kikkert, who is seated here to my left.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Carroll, and good morning, Mr. Kikkert.

All right. We're here today for the sentencing of Mr. Eric Kikkert.

I'll begin by explaining the process of this sentencing.

And before I do that, I have a lot of screens in front of me today, and my primary screen is my laptop where I have all the filings and my notes for today, and where I take notes during the hearing, so if I'm looking down, I just want you to

2

1

3

5

10:03:20

6

7

8

9

10:03:37 10

12

13

11

14

10:03:59 15

17

16

18

19

10:04:09 20

21

22

23

24

10:04:27 25

know that I'm not ignoring you, I'm probably taking notes on my laptop or referencing materials related to what you're saying.

So in terms for the process for the hearing today, I'll start by letting everyone know all the materials I have received and read in preparation for this sentencing, to make sure I haven't missed anything.

And actually, I'm going to go ahead and remove my mask.

Then the sentencing will occur in essentially five steps: First, confirmation of the crime being pled to; second, I will address the presentence report; third, I'll discuss with the prosecutor and defense attorney what sentencing guidelines and sentencing range applies to this case based upon Mr. Kikkert's criminal history and considering any mitigating or aggravating factors that may warrant a departure under the sentencing guidelines manual, and I will enter findings about the applicable guidelines range.

This part of the hearing, in particular, may sound very formal, but I'm required to make certain findings for the record, so bear with me.

Fourth, I will provide time for the prosecutor, defense attorney, anyone else in the courtroom, and Mr. Kikkert to tell me what sentence you think is appropriate.

But, Mr. Kikkert, you don't have to talk to me if you don't want to. And I won't hold it against you if you choose not to talk.

1 Finally, I will address the sentencing factors I must 2 consider, and then impose the sentence. I have received and reviewed the following documents 3 submitted in advance of this hearing: the indictment, Plea 4 5 Agreement, the probation office's status reports, the final 10:04:41 6 presentence investigation report, the probation office's sentencing recommendation, and sentencing memoranda from the 7 8 government and from Mr. Kikkert and Mr. Kikkert's letter to me. 9 Are there any other documents submitted for sentencing that I did not state on the record or that I should consider? 10 10:04:59 11 MR. WOODS: Not aware of any, Your Honor. 12 MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Carroll, can you confirm that Mr. Kikkert has pled to 14 15 and is here to be sentenced for the crime of making interstate 10:05:11 16 threats in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 875(c)? MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. 17 18 THE COURT: The final presentence report was filed on 19 September 19th, 2022 at Docket No. 38. 20 And the probation office's sentencing recommendation was 10:05:31 21 filed on the same day at Docket 39. 22 Ms. Whaley, thank you for your work on the report and 23 recommendation. 24 Is there anything that needs to be corrected or added to 10:05:44 25 the PSR.

1 U.S. PROBATION OFFICER WHALEY: Not that I'm aware of, 2 Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Woods, have you received and reviewed the PSR? 4 5 MR. WOODS: I have, Your Honor. 10:05:53 Does the government have any objection to 6 THE COURT: 7 any of the factual determinations set forth in the presentence 8 report? 9 MR. WOODS: We do not. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Carroll, have you received and read 10:06:01 the PSR? 11 12 MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Have you discussed the presentence report 14 with your client? 15 MR. CARROLL: Yes. I have. Your Honor. 10:06:09 16 THE COURT: Does Mr. Kikkert have any objection to any 17 of the factual statements set forth in the presentence report? 18 MR. CARROLL: No, not in the presentence report, Your 19 Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. And, Counsel, you may remove 10:06:19 21 your mask when speaking if you would like, but it's your choice. 22 I have a few questions for Mr. Kikkert. But before I 23 discuss any matters with you today, I'll have our courtroom 24 deputy put you under oath, which is my standard practice in 10:06:36 25 these proceedings.

1 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. 2 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're 3 about to give in the cause now before the Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 10:06:50 (Defendant sworn.) 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 So, Mr. Kikkert, did you read the presentence report? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Did you discuss the presentence report 10:06:58 11 with your attorney? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Do you feel that you've had enough time to 14 talk with your attorney about the presentence report and the 15 papers filed by the government in connection with this 10:07:07 16 sentencing? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Are you fully satisfied with your attorney 18 19 in this case? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 10:07:14 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 22 I'll accept the factual recitation in the presentence 23 report regarding the circumstances of the offense. And the 24 facts as stated in the presentence report will be the Court's 25 findings of fact for the purpose of this sentencing. 10:07:28

1 So now we arrive at the technical part of this hearing. 2 The presentence report lays out the probation office's calculation of the advisory guideline range that applies in this 3 case. We get to the guideline range by looking at, first, the 4 offense level; and second, Mr. Kikkert's criminal history 5 10:07:46 6 category. 7 Using the 2021 Guidelines Manual, the calculation is as 8 follows: 9 With respect to the offense level, beginning with the guidelines offense level, the applicable guideline in this case 10 10:07:59 11 is Section 2A6.1, which has a base offense level of 12. Because the offense involved more than two threats, the 12 13 guidelines add two levels. And because the sentencing guidelines Sections 3A1.2(a)(1) 14 15 and (2) apply, as the victims are government officers, the 10:08:20 16 guidelines adds six levels. 17 After these adjustments, the offense level total --18 subtotal is 20. The presentence report indicates that Mr. Kikkert has 19 demonstrated acceptance of responsibility, so pursuant to 20 10:08:35 21 sentencing guideline section 3E1.1, there is a three level 22 decrease; therefore, prior to the consideration of any 23 departures or variances. Mr. Kikkert's total offense level is

Is there any objection to the calculation of the offense

17.

24

10:08:53 25

1 level? 2 MR. WOODS: No, Your Honor. 3 MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Turning to the applicable criminal history 4 5 category, the presentence investigation has found that 10:09:02 6 Mr. Kikkert has prior convictions that receive one criminal 7 history point under section 4A1.1(c) in the guidelines manual. 8 This puts Mr. Kikkert in criminal history category I. 9 Are there any objections to the criminal history calculation? 10 10:09:22 11 MR. WOODS: No, Your Honor. 12 MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: In terms of statutory limitations on the sentence today, the statutory maximum term of imprisonment is 14 15 five years under 18 U.S.C., 875(c), and the Court may not impose 10:09:33 16 a term of supervised release of more than three years under 18 17 U.S.C., Section 3583(b)(2). Given a criminal history category 18 of 1 and an adjusted offense level of 17, the applicable 19 sentencing range in this case under the guidelines is 24 to 30 20 months of imprisonment. And since the offense is a Class D 10:09:57 21 Felony, the guideline range for a term of supervised release is 22 one to three years under Section 5D1.2(a)(2) of the guidelines. 23 Are there any objections to these calculations? MR. WOODS: No, Your Honor. 24 10:10:14 25 MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Have I stated accurately the statutory and 2 guidelines framework under which we are operating in regards to this case? 3 MR. WOODS: Yes, Your Honor. 4 5 MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. 10:10:22 THE COURT: Having determined the applicable guideline 6 7 range, the next step is for the Court to consider departures. 8 The presentence report does not include any departure 9 grounds and neither party has mentioned any. 10 Is there any basis for a departure as distinguished from a 10:10:35 11 variance that the parties wish to assert? No, Your Honor. 12 MR. WOODS: 13 MR. CARROLL: No. Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Before I discuss the Section 3553(a) 15 factors that will bear on my final decision, I would like to 10:10:49 16 give the parties the opportunity to address the sentencing 17 guideline calculation, the 3553(a) factors, the special 18 conditions, or anything else you believe I should consider. 19 Mr. Woods, does the government wish to speak? 20 MR. WOODS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 10:11:07 21 Your Honor, there are two values that I think are 22 particularly important in trying to determine the right sentence 23 and outcome in this case. And unfortunately, they pull in 24 opposite directions. And they are compassion and public safety. 10:11:32 25 And let's start with compassion. You know, a lot of online threat cases, particularly those that are directed at political leaders, are grounded in malice, grounded in ill will, in spite, in some true wrongdoing fashion where the intent is purely ill will.

Here, it's a more complicated picture. And Mr. Kikkert, when he was involved in this offense, was not well. He was sick. He was ill. He knew what he was doing. He purposely wanted people to be scared, that is true, and that's why this case is properly before this Court, and the basis for Mr. Kikkert's plea, but his mind was not well.

And that's particularly disheartening and sad because of Mr. Kikkert's history, his service to this country, under conditions that I could not even begin to imagine or describe and understand how that must have been in terms of what he experienced in Iraq and then the return to this country.

The compassion weighs very heavily in how the government looked at this case and its ultimate recommendation that a term of imprisonment is not appropriate.

But public safety is a very important piece of this puzzle. When we were evaluating this case, when it first came to light, you know, I talked to the King County Prosecutor who was in charge of civil commitment. And then that was a possible option for Mr. Kikkert, to just stay in civil commitment proceedings. And we just concluded, she concluded, that the safety risks were just too high to let this case just stay in a civil setting.

10:11:56

10:12:25 10

10:12:51

10:13:17

10:13:40 25

1 And you can understand why that's the case. I mean, Mr. Kikkert 2 didn't simply just spout online, didn't just simply post things 3 or make phone calls, he tried to get a gun. And it is not true that the gun crisis in this country is caused by the mentally 4 5 ill, that's not what drives violence in the country, but the 6 opposite is true, which is that there are notable examples for 7 people who are suffering and dealing with extreme mental illness 8 carry out horrific crimes. And I don't need to list what those 9 are for the Court. 10 And what happened here was scary. I mean, Mr. Kikkert was 10:14:24 11 repeatedly saying he was going to carry out acts of violence.

He talked about getting a gun, despite being a prohibited person. And he traveled all the way across the country from Kent, Washington to Washington, D.C. to confront the very officials he was talking about harming.

And I didn't include for the Court's consideration the actual audio recordings of some of the voicemails he left. I didn't want to sort of sensationalize the sentencing. Mr. Carroll has them. And if he thinks I'm misinterpreting them, he can tell the Court that, but they're scary to hear because he's clearly not in a right state of mind. At one point he's singing for a good minute and a half some random song and then delves into words of extreme violence. It was a concerning picture. And it's because of that framework, because of the extreme concern about public safety, that these conditions of

10:14:04

12

13 14

15

10:14:45

16

17

18 19

20

10:15:02

21

22

23

24

10:15:29 25

supervision I think are critical for the Court to consider and impose.

And they sort of break into two categories in terms of what's in dispute for the Court: Mental health conditions and then electronic monitoring conditions.

And for the mental health conditions, if we just step back for a moment, I think two things are worth mentioning. The first is Mr. Kikkert is currently operating under those conditions as a condition of the pretrial bond in this case. So, really, the question for the Court is less if you think about it should the Court impose those, it's should the Court relax those. I mean, I understand, ultimately the question for the Court is whether to issue those as part of the judgment.

But that's what the status quo is now, he's subject to those conditions as part of the Court's pretrial bond authorizing his release in this case.

And second, these conditions were not sort of presented to the Court out of whole cloth. As the Court saw in our sentencing memo, they've been imposed in other cases with the Federal Public Defender's Office. And they were the product of negotiation with a senior attorney at the Federal Public Defender's Office, started in the Verhul case, which was assigned to Judge Jones that I cited in our memo. And they represent a balance of the liberty interests and other interests of Mr. Kikkert versus insuring his safety and his compliance.

10:15:50

10:16:10 10

10:16:27

10:16:49 20

10:17:11 25

2

1

3

5

7

8

10:17:36

6

9

10:18:04 10

12

11

14

13

10:18:24

16

15

17

18 19

10:18:47 20

21

22

23

24

10:19:10 25

And so -- and specifically, the two mental health conditions that are under challenge are medication and then surrendering to civil commitments. Let's talk about those.

The medication provision, let's start with what it doesn't What it doesn't do is say that the probation officer will just order Mr. Kikkert, you must take your medication. What it does is it sets forth a process where, first, a mental health professional, a psychiatrist, a doctor, someone who has specialized training and experience, unlike with respect to everyone else in this courtroom, who can say medication is or is not appropriate. They have the first call. And if they say it's not appropriate, then this is moot. But if they say it is appropriate, it's not a violation, it's not something where Mr. Kikkert can be hauled into jail if he doesn't take his medication right there on the spot. What this Court would do is if Mr. Kikkert challenged that determination and said that's not appropriate for X, Y, and Z reasons, this Court would hold a hearing, and we would all reconvene, and the Court could hear from the doctor directly as to why, in their judgment, they think it's appropriate or not appropriate. Mr. Carroll, who is a very skilled advocate, could tell the Court whether that's not correct or whatever the defense position is, and the Court, ultimately, would make that determination.

And that is far preferable to the alternative, which is that if a medical professional says medication is appropriate

1 and needed, Mr. Kikkert can simply say no. And I don't make 2 that statement lightly. I am well aware that people who are suffering from mental health challenges often report that 3 medication has an adverse effect on their state of being and how 4 they go about their day, fuzziness of thinking, other side 5 10:19:41 6 effects. 7

But because of the extreme danger that Mr. Kikkert posed, at least during this period, trying to get a gun, I think it's appropriate that a mental health provider -- or there's at least some world in which medication may be both necessary and appropriate to protect the public health, again, with the court backdrop of having a hearing to determine ultimately that that's So that's issue one. important.

Issue two is this provision that says -- that, again, has been posed in other cases, that if a mental health provider says things have gotten so bad for Mr. Kikkert that he needs to submit to civil commitment that he needs to be hospitalized, that that is part of this condition of supervision. And of course, the Court could promptly hold a hearing and determine whether, indeed, that is appropriate or, instead, some other steps should be made.

You know, the defense challenge to that is, well, wait, there's a Washington State, King County civil system, just let that play out. But Mr. Kikkert is not a member of the public, he is, after today, going to be under the supervision of this

8

9

10

11

10:20:02

12

13

14

15

10:20:23

16

17

18

20

21

19

10:20:47

22

23

24

10:21:11 25

Court in terms of what he can and he cannot do. You know, supervision necessarily curtails liberty.

And the way I look at this provision is it's really an extension of the standard mental health condition that the Court -- is being proposed to the Court, it's not even being challenged, which is, in general, he has to undergo mental health treatment and follow the recommendations of his treatment provider. And if one of those recommendations is he needs to be committed for some period of time to stabilize his mental health, that is a necessary consequence or result of just what would be a standard condition of the recommendations of the treatment provider. But what this provision does is it allows and recognizes that, of course, we would have a hearing promptly to make sure that his liberty interest was protected and, indeed, that was the right result.

Because he's under the supervision of the Court, this Court should be making that determination, as opposed to down the street in King County, which is, of course, apart, separate, outside of the framework of this case.

So those are the two conditions, which, again, are currently in effect that we think should continue to remain in effect as part of the terms of supervision.

The second sort of disputed condition is electronic monitoring. And I take it there are sort of two -- let me start with, the Court should do that because this offense, as the

10:21:30

10:21:51 10

10:22:13 15

10:22:29 20

10:22:53 25

10.00.10

10:23:18 5

10:23:41 10

10:24:03 15

10:24:28

10:24:55 25

Court saw, involved computers. You know, Mr. Kikkert made some of the threatening comments by computer, he posted on Facebook some of the -- at least one of the threatening comments, and then, again, tried to acquire a gun using social media. So computers were part of this offense.

And what I understand the defense objection to be is sort of twofold. The first is this notion that this case is like the *Sales* case, that Ninth Circuit case about -- it's just too broad to impose monitoring for this type of offense. And *Sales* is apples and oranges from this case. That case involved counterfeiting. And the conduct in that case was using a scanner or some other computer equipment to try and fabricate whatever the counterfeit notes were in that case.

And you could understand in the context of that case in terms of coming up with the appropriate condition to ensure that that type of conduct did not occur in the future could be and appropriately would be somewhat narrow. You don't need to monitor someone's social media account if the underlying offense conduct is limited to scanning and fabricating on the computer different commercial notes. Those are unconnected.

But here, the concern is that not only did Mr. Kikkert use the computer to communicate both his threats and the manner in which he would potentially carry out the threats, also his communications and his -- would be a window into the state of his mental health. I mean, a lot of the communications are just

1 rambling, they don't make any sense, they're nonsensical. And 2 that would be a state or a flag as to what his -- what the state of his mental health was. So we do think that that's 3 4 appropriate. 5 You know, there's this objection that it can't be so broad 10:25:18 to be any computer at all. And to the extent the Court was 6 7 concerned about that, I think the condition, and we could write 8 this in, would be limited to computers that are able to 9 communicate with others or access web content. I think that, in 10 the heartland, would be the type of computer conduct that would 10:25:39 11 be appropriate to monitor. 12 The second sort of objection from the defense is, well, 13 look, he did this all out in the open, he used his real name, 14 this wasn't a dark web type of case where he was trying to hide 15 what he was doing, so we don't really need to monitor him. 10:26:01 16 the problem is --

> THE COURT: Counsel, I have a clarifying question there. On the Facebook post, was he using his real name?

MR. WOODS: I believe he was. And if he wasn't, he was posting his own picture. He wasn't trying to hide it, so I'm not going to -- the Court should assume he was open and notorious.

But the challenge there is what is the probation officer going to have visibility to see. I mean that -- if they are sort of cutoff from his e-mail communications, from any private

17

18

19

10:26:12

21

22

20

23

24 10:26:31 25

1 Facebook messages that are used, or anything that is not, you 2 know, sort of you can discover through Google, which, let's face 3 it, would be a small slice of his internet activity, you're left, or the Court is left, with what fortunately happened here, 4 5 which is that people came forward and said we're concerned about 10:26:54 6 what's happening. But that was fortuitous, that very well would 7 not -- could not have happened for a million reasons, and so 8 that type of monitoring would be effective. 9 And, you know, as with all supervised release cases, this 10:27:13 10 will be a journey as opposed to just a destination here today.

I mean, if Mr. Kikkert six months from now, a year from now, whatever it is, is doing great, he's employed, you know, there's no signs of mental distress, his health is fine, of course the Court should at that point, very well with the government's recommendation, relax the requirements. I mean, we joined the defense request or at least didn't oppose his release in this case pending the sentencing because he had shown some improvement, so, you know, that is an option.

But I think from a starting out point from where we are today, at least for some period of time, these are the two conditions that will help ensure his -- the public safety and, and will also further that first goal of compassion, because what we all don't want to have happen here is for another criminal case to start, for Mr. Kikkert to return to jail. I don't want to see him in jail. I didn't -- I take no

10:27:36

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

10:27:54

22

23

21

24

25 10:28:19

1 pleasure at all in Mr. Kikkert having a felony conviction in 2 this case, these proceedings, we want him to be well. But if he 3 shows the signs and he goes down this path again, to protect that public safety, that's where we get involved. And I think 4 5 these two conditions will be early guardrails and markers to 10:28:45 6 insure we don't get back to where we were at the start of this 7 case, and that's why we recommend the Court impose them. 8 And I do, of course, think the Court should impose three 9 years of supervised release. 10 And I'm happy to answer any of the Court's questions. 10:28:59 11 THE COURT: I have no further questions. Thank you, 12 Counsel. 13 Mr. Carroll. 14 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 We ask the Court to follow the joint recommendation in 10:29:14 16 terms of time served term of custody. 17 Probation department has eloquently outlined its reasons 18 for that, as well as the government. I think it's warranted in 19

Probation department has eloquently outlined its reasons for that, as well as the government. I think it's warranted in light of Mr. Kikkert's mental health issues, his military service, which are the likely cause of those mental health issues, his past trauma, and I would add his performance on pretrial supervision.

Mr. Kikkert was arrested in early April. He spent about three months in custody already, was released in July. He's taken responsibility, he's pled guilty. He and I have had many,

20

21

22

23

24

10:29:35

10:30:15

10:30:34 10

10:30:54 15

10:31:18 20

10:31:37 25

many conversations about, you know, the fact that these kind of statements are not the way to effect any policy change or get any attention to issues that he thinks is appropriate.

Unfortunately, you know, the -- these type of statements have become a little bit more normalized in certain media circles in this country. And I think Mr. Kikkert is -- given his background and mental health issues is perhaps a bit vulnerable to those sorts of media circles. He's not blaming anyone else, he takes full responsibility, but I think that's something that should be recognized.

He's in treatment and counseling at the VA. I think it's all laid out in the probation recommendation. There is a section or a part of the probation recommendation that notes he's resistant to treatment, but just to be clear, he is in biweekly counseling at the VA. He sees a psychologist biweekly. He started a coping skills class or group at VA. He's in a co-occurring disorder group. He's reinstated his housing benefits, he's looking for an appropriate housing placement, one that's in a low crime area, which I think is good that he's being patient waiting for a good place to go, one that won't trigger him, won't -- you know, one that won't raise his anxiety levels.

There is some concern expressed about his resistance to antipsychotic medications. Mr. Kikkert has been very clear about that. But I do want to let the Court know that he has

1 gotten the referral to see a psychiatrist through the VA. That 2 was done about two weeks ago. He's waiting to hear back on the appointment. He was told that that can take some time because 3 the resources for the psychiatrist through the VA is -- it's 4 5 kind of thin. But he's willing to see a psychiatrist, he's 10:32:00 6 willing to talk about medications, and take it from there. 7 And so at this point, I think a term of custody would be 8 counterproductive, it wouldn't be consistent with the 3553(a) 9 factors, and, in fact, it would be a setback in terms of

Turning to the supervised release conditions, I'll start with the computer search and computer monitoring conditions, which I don't think are in place on the current bond. The conditions allow probation to search any computer owned or operated by Mr. Kikkert, and there's the computer monitoring program. It basically monitors all activity on his electronic devices, whether it be a phone or a computer.

promoting community safety and specific deterrents.

The conditions have to be reasonably related to the sentencing factors and narrowly tailored or the least restrictive means necessary. And here, the conditions proposed are not sufficiently narrow, they're too broad. And I would suggest that they're not sufficiently related to the underlying offense.

Looking at the PSR, Mr. Kikkert, yes, he used a computer in some instances, but I think most of the time these were phone

10:32:19

12

10

11

13

15

14

10:32:42

16 17

18

19

10:33:05 20

21

22

23

24

10:33:25 25

1 calls or voicemails.

Some of the statements cited in the PSR were personal encounters with Washington, D.C. Secret Service or Capitol Police.

THE COURT: Mr. Carroll, this includes all electronic devices; correct?

MR. CARROLL: That's -- yes. I would suggest the condition is quite broad.

THE COURT: And that would include internet enabled cell phones, as we had some text messages in this case?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. Yes. I'm not sure it would apply to, say, a flip phone that does text messages. I would ask probation -- so probation is nodding yes, so, yes, it would apply to anything.

And the computer monitoring program basically allows a search of just everything. And as the government points out, they admit this condition is really just to monitor his inner thinking, to keep tabs on him, to see where his thoughts are going, to see whether he's writing rational things.

And, you know, Mr. Kikkert uses a computer to -- he writes poetry, he shared some of his poetry with me. He keeps a journal. He maintains a website for -- to sort of outline his religious views that's publicly available. He uses a computer and phone to schedule medical and mental health appointments, to maintain benefits.

10:33:44

7

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10:33:57 10

11

12 13

14

10:34:17 15

16

17

18 19

10:34:40 20

21

22

23

24

10:35:05 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

20 21

> 23 24

22

10:36:52 25

And the computer monitoring program is costly. monthly fee as well as an initial start-up fee for each separate device.

THE COURT: Mr. Carroll, in terms of the government's statements that this is really a journey, and we're headed down a path to see what treatment might be effective, what is your response to the fact that we can revisit this? If it's going well, not just the mental health treatment, but the computer monitoring, that we can revisit these conditions. And why shouldn't we start more protective given the unpredictability of this path and the seriousness of the threats that were made?

MR. CARROLL: Well, I would suggest the Court focus, instead, on his behavior and how he's doing with the conditions, whether his treatment providers are raising alarm bells. And rather than starting up high and maybe ratcheting down, which if I were Mr. Kikkert, I would just say I'm not using any of these devices, and so there'd be nothing to monitor.

What I would suggest is that the Court not impose these conditions, but if there are issues, then the Court can always modify the conditions. That's something else the Court can do. So rather than taking a tight ratchet and then maybe loosening sometime in the future, I would suggest the opposite in terms of these computer monitoring conditions.

Does that address the Court's question? THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

1

2

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you.

3

4

10:37:10

6

5

7 8

9

10 10:37:33

> 11 12

13

14

15

10:37:53

16

17

18

19

20 10:38:15

22

21

23

24

25 10:38:37

And again, Mr. Kikkert was open and notorious about who he was. And this is not a situation where -- like a child pornography offense, or a dark web case, or a fraud case where someone is surreptitiously using the internet to commit crimes. If Mr. Kikkert is going to reengage in this behavior, which I'm confident he's not, it's not going to be some secretive, anonymous posting or messaging, it's going to be open and notorious and easily identifiable.

And I would suggest that this case is a lot like the Sales case. Yes, that -- the crime committed in that case was a bit different, but the principles still apply, and I would say even more so. Sales was decided in 2007.

Since then, it's really hard to do much without having a computer -- regular access to a computer. You can't search for a job without a computer. You can't manage benefits without using a computer, or it's at least very difficult to. Communicating with your treatment providers usually requires e-mail or text messages.

So the ubiquitousness with which computers are in our lives really goes to how extremely expansive this kind of condition is, as noted by the Sales court.

And I would point out, there really are no limitations to the probation department's computer monitoring program. There's no limits to that, so it's very, very intrusive. And the case

law requires that the conditions be narrowly tailored to achieve the goals of sentencing.

I do want to point out, in the government's memo, they pointed out texts Mr. Kikkert sent to the probation office, and I kind of want to put those in context. I don't know if probation has communicated with the Court about that, but Mr. Kikkert and I were communicating by text and e-mail about the recommendation, and we were having a robust discussion about it. And at about the same time, probation texted him and said, hey, we need to do a home visit. And so Mr. Kikkert started replying, he thought he was replying to me, he was replying to the probation department, but he quickly got back to the probation department and, you know, texted probation that -- an apology that, you know, sorry, those texts were meant for my lawyer. Yes, we can do a home inspection, let's schedule that. Here's when I'm busy, here's when I'm available. And again, he apologized for the response.

I would suggest an alternative condition. And Mr. Kikkert would disclose his e-mail addresses, any social media platforms that he's on, his phone number. And, yes, that requires that we trust that he's going to actually disclose everything. But if there are any issues, probation can monitor his website. They can monitor his social media. It can be a condition that he has to like friend them if he's on Facebook. I don't know if he's still on Facebook.

10:39:00

10:39:19 10

10:39:41 15

10:40:04 20

10:40:29 25

1 But, again, this is not an offense that was committed 2 secretly or anonymously, so I just don't think the condition is 3 appropriate here. Turning to the medication and civil commitment conditions, 4 5 again, we have no objection to the requirement that he 10:40:45 6 participate in treatment. But, again, the focus should be on 7 his behavior, not whether or not he's taking his medications 8 every day. And I don't think the Court should inject itself 9 into those sorts of determinations. Those are medical issues. 10 And the case law is pretty clear that this Court has to make a 10:41:05 11 thorough inquiry that is medically based before ordering such a 12 thing. And here, we don't even know --13 THE COURT: Isn't that built into the special condition? 14 15 MR. CARROLL: Well, it does allow for a hearing before 10:41:25 16 this Court, but it doesn't require -- the condition does not 17 have any, what I can see, are really articulable standards, 18 50 --19 THE COURT: But I'm bound by that case law; correct? 20 MR. CARROLL: True. 10:41:41 21 But the condition doesn't outline what's appropriate, what 22 goal the medication is necessary to achieve, is it necessary to make him competent? Well, it's clearly not an issue here, Mr. 23 24 Kikkert is competent, he's doing well.

10:42:03 25

Typically, forced medication cases under *United States v.*

Sell, you have a Sell hearing where there's a particular goal that needs to be achieved for the medication. Is it necessary to make the person competent, for example. And here, the condition is just, well, if someone recommends it.

And so, antipsychotic medications, the government acknowledges that, you know, that's a big deal, it's very intrusive. And here, we're not even sure what it is that would be recommended. And again, this is something that could be ratcheted up. If we learn that something is recommended and he's not doing well, then perhaps it could be modified to add that, and we can have a hearing about it.

But, again, I think the Court should focus on how he's doing in the community, whether he's otherwise compliant and responsive to probation, rather than starting off with conditions such as this that -- which can be viewed as very intrusive. And I think, also, it would start Mr. Kikkert off on the wrong foot with probation.

And similarly, with the involuntary treatment issue.

Again, the Involuntary Treatment Act has very specific and well-defined terms that justify commitment for specific periods of time. There are mental health professionals who are trained under the law who are very familiar with the process. And they make the initial commitment decisions based on whether the person is a danger to themselves or gravely disabled or a danger to others.

10:42:26

10:42:44 10

10:43:06

10:43:27

10:43:53 25

1 And here, there's no real standard outline, it's just, 2 well, if someone -- if a mental health professional, if like --3 who, is that a social worker? Is that a psychiatrist? What is required there, what qualifications, and also, for what reason? 4 5 Is it necessary because he's not complying with conditions? 10:44:13 6 Well, the Court has options. The Court can get an arrest 7 warrant. 8 So without any standards, I'm not just not sure whether the 9 condition is workable in real time for those involved with Mr. 10 Kikkert's supervision. 10:44:35 11 And again, there are other tools. Probation could get a 12 warrant. They can call a designated crisis responder who is 13 trained and have that person initiate commitment if that is 14 necessary. 15 So we would ask that those conditions not be imposed. 10:44:51 16 Again, overall, Your Honor, the Court is directed to impose 17 the minimum term necessary, and I think that also -- that sort 18 of language applies to the supervised release conditions, that they should be narrowly tailored. And here, a narrowly tailored 19 20 judgment should not include those conditions. 10:45:12 21 I don't have anything to add, unless the Court has any 22 questions. 23 And I know Mr. Kikkert has a short statement for the Court. 24 THE COURT: I have no further questions. 10:45:24 25 And before we hear from Mr. Kikkert, does either party have

1 any witnesses or witness statements that they would like to present? 2 3 MR. WOODS: No, Your Honor. MR. CARROLL: No. Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Is there any other person that 10:45:32 would like to address the Court regarding either the government 6 7 or defense counsel's recommendation? 8 All right. Hearing nothing, Mr. Kikkert, you have a right 9 to make a statement. 10 I have reviewed your letter to me, but if you want to make 10:45:48 11 a statement, now is your opportunity to tell me anything at all 12 that you want me to know before I impose the sentence, but you 13 also don't have to make a statement. As I said, if you don't 14 want to, I won't hold that against you. 15 Would you like to say anything that you would like me to 10:46:04 16 consider before imposing my sentence? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. MR. CARROLL: Would you like Mr. Kikkert to approach 18 19 the lectern or --20 THE COURT: Whatever is more comfortable for you, Mr. 10:46:14 21 Kikkert. 22 And you may remove your mask, if that's more comfortable. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the things I said and did, 24 it was just to get attention, as I felt I had no other choice to 10:46:32 25 be heard. I did so without intent to do harm. I do apologize.

10:47:03 10:47:29 10:47:44 10:48:04

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I will not threaten anyone again. I live a life of peace and sanctity of all life, and I want you to understand that I do understand my mistake. And I ask for mercy.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I will now turn to the 18 U.S.C. 3553(a) factors.

After calculating the sentencing guidelines and departures and hearing the statements made by counsel and Mr. Kikkert, I will now consider the relevant factors set out by Congress in 18 U.S.C., Section 3553(a), and insure that I impose a sentence that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary to comply where the purposes of sentencing.

There are seven factors I should consider under Section 3553, and I will go through each of them in my considerations under each now.

First, with respect to the nature and circumstances of the offense. Mr. Kikkert, you've pled guilty to one count of interstate threats. These threats were made to public officials, public servants, and the threats were extremely serious, including threats of bodily injury and death.

You physically traveled to Washington, D.C. where those public officials were located, and you posted on social media and texted about obtaining firearms and body armer. threats and actions are inexcusable.

I do recognize, though, that you have accepted responsibility for committing this serious crime. And I also 2
 3

4

5

10:48:40

6 7

8

9

10:48:55 10

11

13

14

12

10:49:14 15

16

17

18

19

10:49:32 20

21

22

23

24

10:49:52 25

recognize that as the government states in its sentencing memorandum and repeated today, your actions stemmed from mental illness, rather than malice.

With respect to the history and characteristics of Mr.

Kikkert, I first acknowledge that you've served your country in the military, and that you enlisted at a young age, right around the time that you earned your GED. I thank you for your service.

I also acknowledge that you experienced trauma during your service and are suffering from PTSD as a result.

In your outpatient health assessment from the VA in July of this year, you were again diagnosed with PTSD, and you were also diagnosed with delusional disorder and alcohol use disorder.

In terms of your life before today, you've experienced some violence in your life. You were stabbed by your sister when you were only two years old, and you observed and experienced abusive behavior by your father. You've also experienced violence from others in the past several years. And you lost your father in 2019. And I'm very sorry for your loss.

You're now 37 years old, and you've taken positive steps to address some of the problems you're experiencing. You attended a two-year PTSD class, have been seeing a psychologist biweekly, and have been attending an active recovery group every year.

With your GED and other training, you've been able to work in several fields outside your work in the military, as a

building inspector and as night lead at a grocery store. And according to your statements to the pretrial supervision office, you would like to look for work again. You've also turned to faith and religious practice.

In terms of factor three, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrents to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner, I need to weigh the extremely serious and dangerous nature of the crime you committed and your criminal history with the promise that government and probation see in you because they recommend a sentence that is very significantly below what the sentencing guidelines recommend.

With respect to the fourth factor, the kinds of sentences available and the sentencing range established for the applicable category of the offense committed by the applicable category of the defendant as set in the guidelines, I will take this moment to describe generally the applicable statutory and guidelines penalties for this offense.

And, Counsel, I'll ask you to confirm whether this description is accurate.

Under the statutes, the charge for interstate threats

10:50:09

10:50:29 10

10:50:48 15

10:51:05

10:51:19 25

1 carries a term of imprisonment for up to five years, with a term 2 of supervised release limited to three years. Under the guidelines, a total offense level of 17, with a criminal history 3 category of 1 carries a term of imprisonment of 24 to 30 months. 4 And the supervised release term for a Class D Felony, like this 5 10:51:40 6 one, is one to three years. 7 Since the offense is a Class D Felony, under the statute, 8 Mr. Kikkert is eligible for not less than one, nor more than 9 five years probation; however, since the applicable guideline 10 range is in Zone D of the sentencing table, he is ineligible for 10:51:58 11 probation under the guidelines. Under 18 U.S.C., Section 3571(b), a fine of up to 250,000 12 13 can be imposed, while the guidelines fine range is between 14 \$10,000 and \$95,000. 15 Under 18 U.S.C., Section 3013(a)(2)(a), there is a \$100 10:52:17 16 mandatory special assessment for the charge. 18 U.S.C., Section 3663(a) makes restitution mandatory in 17 this case. The guidelines also state that the Court shall enter 18 a restitution order for the full amount of the victim's loss, 19 but in this case the victims are not seeking restitution. 20 10:52:40 21 Counsel, have I stated accurately the statutory and 22 guidelines framework under which we're operating in regard to 23 this case? 24 MR. WOODS: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor.

10:52:50 25

1 2 parties and probation have recommended is significantly lower than what's allowed for by the statutes and guidelines for the 3 4 5 10:53:04 6 7 8 9 10 10:53:21 11 12 13 14 15 10:53:35 16 17 18 19

charges to which you've pled. With respect to the fifth factor, any pertinent policy statement, I believe the only guidelines policy statement applicable here is Section 6B1.2, standards for acceptance of plea agreements. Do the parties believe any other policy statement applies?

THE COURT: So, Mr. Kikkert, the sentence that the

MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor.

MR. WOODS:

THE COURT: With regard to the policy statements on standard for acceptance of plea agreements with respect to Rule 11(c)(1)(A), I am satisfied that the Plea Agreement adequately reflects the seriousness of the actual offense behavior and accepting the Plea Agreement will not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing or the sentencing guidelines.

No, Your Honor.

With respect to Rule 11(c)(1)(B), I'm satisfied that the recommended sentence pursuant to the Plea Agreement is outside the applicable guidelines range, but for justifiable reasons.

And the reasons that have been set forthwith specificity in the presentence report and the parties briefing will be included in the Statement of Reasons form.

With respect to the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been

25 10:54:13

20

21

22

23

24

10:53:52

1 found guilty of similar conduct, the parties have recommended 2 that I vary downward from the guideline range. I looked at the Sentencing Commission's Judiciary Sentencing Information System 3 or JSIN, just so we all have some point of reference, but that's 4 5 all it is, a data point for me. 10:54:28 6 If I used JSIN correctly for those in Mr. Kikkert's same 7 offense level, criminal history category, and primary guideline, 8 62 percent of the sentences imposed were a downward departure or 9 variance from the guideline range during the last five fiscal years, from 2017 to 2021. It is a very small sample size, but 10 10:54:48 11 15 percent, 1-5, of sentences were a probation or a fine only. 12 13 14 15 the victims are not seeking restitution. 10:55:10 16

And the last factor is the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense. The statute and the guidelines make restitution mandatory in this case, but, again, in this case,

Based on the Court's consideration of all of the 3553(a) factors, I will now state the sentence to be imposed:

It is the judgment of the Court that you, Mr. Kikkert, are hereby sentenced to time served, followed by a term of three years of supervised release on Count I.

The Court finds that you do not have the ability to pay a fine and, therefore, waives imposition of a fine in this case. However, the Court cannot waive and must impose a special assessment fine in the amount of \$100, which is due immediately.

Within 30 days of any change of address, you must notify

10:55:28

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10:55:46 25

10:56:02 10:56:15 15 10:56:31 10:56:47

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

23

24 10:57:03 25

the Clerk of Court of the change until such time as the financial obligation is paid in full.

The Court waives any interest or penalties that may accrue on unpaid balances.

Within 72 hours, you shall report in person to the probation office.

And while on supervision, you shall abide by the mandatory as well as general conditions of supervision adopted by the U.S. Probation Office.

In addition, you will abide by the special conditions set out by the U.S. Probation Office. I find that these special conditions are appropriate and necessary based on the facts and circumstances presented.

I will also go over my additional rationale for the four special conditions in dispute.

The first special condition requires you to allow a probation officer to inspect any personal computer that you own This is a standard we frequently impose where, as or operate. here, a crime has been committed using electronic devices and online resources. The reasons for this condition are related to the reasons for the next condition, so I'll go over the reasons after I go over the next condition.

The second special concern requires you to comply with the requirements of the probation and pretrial services computer monitoring program as directed. You shall consent to U.S.

1 Probation and Pretrial Services Office conducting ongoing 2 monitoring of your computer, hardware, and software, and any 3 electronic devices or media. The monitoring will include the installation, at your expense, of hardware or software systems 4 5 that allow evaluation of your computer use. Monitoring may also 6 include the retrieval and copying of all data from your 7 computers or any other electronic devices or media. 8 You may be subject to quarterly polygraph testing at your 9 And this is solely to ensure compliance with the 10:57:42 10 monitoring program.

> You also content to U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services use of electronic detection devices to evaluate your access to Wi-Fi connections.

The Court is imposing these conditions because you used electronic devices and online access to commit your crime, a very serious crime, that included threats to someone's life. And in a matter of days from sending an e-mail stating that you would assume the role of acting president with the law of the land, you traveled to Washington, D.C., and then posted on Facebook that you wanted to buy armors, and then sent text messages talking about finding body armor.

Part of the goal of these conditions is to protect you and to protect the public. And given the unpredictability, as I said, of this journey, these kind of manifestations of mental illness, the breadth of online avenues and electronic devices

10:57:25

11 12

13

14

15

10:57:55

16

17

18 19

20

10:58:16

21

23

22

24

10:58:32 25

1 that you used to make your threats, and the fast pace with which 2 those threats escalated to actual travel to the location of the 3 targets of your threats, the computer monitoring condition, coupled with the computer inspection condition, are the least 4 5 restrictive means possible of protecting the public from future 10:58:51 6 offenses, deterring you from committing any future offenses, and 7 ensuring there is timely intervention to get you any help that 8 you may need. 9 Now, as everybody has acknowledged here today, you are 10 doing a great job taking these steps that are needed to improve. 10:59:05 11 And if that continues, we'll certainly revisit this. So this is 12 a path forward for you. 13 I'm going to move on to the fifth and sixth condition. 14 15 10:59:23 16

The fifth special condition, which is expressly listed in section 11 of your Plea Agreement, requires you to participate as directed in a mental health program approved by the United States Probation Office and follow all recommendations of the treatment provider, to include psychotropic medications. However, your refusal to take psychotropic medication prescribed by such treatment provider shall not be a violation of supervised release unless the Court, after affording you due process, determines and orders that you shall be compelled to take such medication and you thereafter violate the Court's order.

You must contribute towards the cost of any programs to the

10:59:56 25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10:59:41

1 extent that you're financially able to do so as determined by 2 the U.S. Probation Office. Given the connection between your mental health issues and the crime for which you've been 3 convicted, this condition is the least restrictive means 4 5 possible of protecting the public from future offenses, 11:00:12 6 deterring you from committing any future offenses, and ensuring 7 that you remain in good mental health, with the aim of 8 rehabilitation. 9 With respect to medication, right now we just don't know if

a psychiatrist will recommend medications for you. I'm pleased to hear that you've made that contact and that an appointment is forthcoming.

I will direct defense counsel to submit to the Court, once you do actually have the result of that meeting, if any medication was prescribed; and if so, what the justification is.

And if you have any concerns with the medication, we will have a hearing.

I will consider the recommendations of your healthcare provider. And if they do prescribe medication, I will direct your probation officer to check in with you at least monthly to see how you feel about the medication and its effectiveness. And if you have any concerns about the medication, I will direct the probation officer to report that to the Court, and the Court will consider making adjustments to this approach as appropriate. And if things are going well, as everybody has

11:00:27

12

13

10

11

14

16

11:00:46

17

18

15

19

20 11:01:02

21

22

23

24

11:01:22 25

11:01:38

11:01:53 10

11:02:10

11:02:22 20

11:02:37 **25**

acknowledged today, we can reduce the frequency of these medication check-ins and reports.

The 6th special condition, which is expressly listed in section 11 of your Plea Agreement, requires you to submit to psychiatric hospitalization if directed by your mental health treatment provider for a period not to exceed 72 hours, which may be extended if ordered by the Court after an opportunity to be heard.

Again, given the connection between your mental health issues and the crime for which you've been convicted, this condition, which is also expressly listed in your Plea Agreement, is the least restrictive means possible of protecting the public from future offenses, deterring you from committing any future offenses, and ensuring that you remain in good mental health, with the aim of rehabilitation.

The probation office shall release the presentence report to all appropriate agencies in order to execute the sentence of the Court.

Treatment agencies shall return the presentence report to the probation office upon Mr. Kikkert's completion or termination from treatment.

I believe that this overall sentence reflects the seriousness of the offense and also is sufficient but no greater than necessary to carry out the objectives of sentencing under the circumstances present in this case.

1 Are there any objections to the sentence as I just stated 2 it that are not already noted on the record? MR. WOODS: No, Your Honor. 3 MR. CARROLL: No. Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: I then hereby order the sentence imposed 11:02:48 6 as just stated. 7 Mr. Woods, do you have the judgment form before you? 8 MR. WOODS: Yes, may I approach Mr. Carroll? 9 I do want to go over Mr. Kikkert's right THE COURT: 10 to appeal, so I'll ask you to wait before approaching Mr. 11:03:01 Carroll. 11 12 Mr. Kikkert, I'm going to go through with you your rights 13 on appeal. 14 It is my understanding that under section 14 of the Plea 15 Agreement, you waived your rights on appeal. And any rights you 11:03:13 16 had on appeal are exactly as stated in that document. If you 17 wish to appeal the sentence, it's very important that you tell 18 your lawyer that is what you want to do. Your attorney can 19 explain what issues may be appealable and what issues survive. If you wish to appeal the sentence, but cannot afford the 20 11:03:31 21 filing fee for Court of Appeals, you can ask me to waive that 22 fee and the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of 23 appeal upon your request. 24 With few exceptions, any notice of appeal must be filed 11:03:46 25 within 14 days of the entry of judgment.

I advise you that you also have the right to challenge your 1 2 counsel's effectiveness. 3 Mr. Kikkert, do you understand each of these rights? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: This concludes the Court's judgment in 11:03:58 6 this case. 7 I will now turn to dismissal of Count 2. As set forth in 8 the Plea Agreement, the government pledged to move to dismiss 9 Count 2 against Mr. Kikkert. 10 Does the government wish to do so now? 11:04:11 11 MR. WOODS: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: That count is dismissed. 12 13 Mr. Kikkert, do you have any questions about anything that has been said at today's hearing. 14 15 (Off the record.) 11:04:22 16 MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, Mr. Kikkert is inquiring 17 whether or not it's possible to set a future date regarding 18 revisiting some of the conditions, particularly the computer 19 monitoring conditions. 20 THE COURT: I'll ask the probation office to weigh in 11:04:48 21 on what that appropriate date might be. 22 U.S. PROBATION OFFICER WHALEY: Your Honor, I would 23 recommend either six months or one year from now. THE COURT: Let's do six months. 24 11:05:00 25 Any further questions?

	1	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
	2	THE COURT: Anything else we should address today?
	3	MR. WOODS: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
	4	MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor.
11:05:08	5	THE COURT: All right. You may show the judgment to
	6	Mr. Carroll.
	7	MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, I've reviewed the judgment.
	8	It is consistent with the Court's oral sentence.
	9	THE COURT: Thank you.
11:05:41	10	You may approach or you may show the probation office.
	11	MR. WOODS: Thank you, Your Honor.
	12	(Off the record.)
	13	MR. WOODS: Your Honor, may I reproach Mr. Carroll?
	14	THE COURT: Yes.
11:06:34	15	MR. WOODS: Your Honor, I showed the judgment again to
	16	Mr. Carroll. May I approach now?
	17	THE COURT: Yes.
	18	MR. CARROLL: Thank you.
	19	THE COURT: I have reviewed the judgment and find it
11:07:32	20	is in good form and have signed it.
	21	I will end this sentencing by emphasizing to everyone that
	22	we sentence people for what they do, not who they are. Everyone
	23	in this room has hope that things will work out for the better
	24	for you, Mr. Kikkert. And that is reflected in the fact that
11:07:47	25	the government, your lawyer, and probation all ask that you be

1 sentenced under, well under, the guidelines range. 2 obviously need to be very serious consequences for the crime you 3 committed, but you've shown that you can accept responsibility for your actions and take steps to get help to improve your 4 5 life. 11:08:03 6 I want to focus on something that you said to me in your 7 letter, which is that you now understand that there is a better 8 way to deal with these issues, and you repeated that again 9 today. And you said in your letter that you're also happiest in 10 exercising your faith and your religion. 11:08:18 11 Mr. Kikkert, at 37 years old, you still have a long life 12 ahead of you. And I hope you continue taking these positive 13 steps in realizing that everyone here wishes the best for you. 14 I'd like to extend my thanks to everybody here for their 15 participation today. 11:08:35 16 We are adjourned. 17 THE CLERK: Please rise. 18 (Court recessed at 11:08 a.m.) 19 CERTIFICATE 20 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from 21 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 22 /s/ Marci E.C. Chatelain 23 Marci E.C. Chatelain, CCR, RPR, RMR, CRR Federal Court Reporter 24 25